UCLA Faculty Association

News and opinion from Dan Mitchell since 2009

Monday, February 9, 2026

Straws in the Wind - Part 248

From Inside Higher Ed: *The College Board will prohibit students from wearing smart glasses—wearable, internet-connected computers that allow users to see a computer display in the lenses—while taking the SAT, starting in March 2026. The organization has long banned any wearable electronics, such as Apple AirPods and Apple Watches, said Priscilla Rodriguez, senior vice president of college readiness assessments at the College Board. Such devices, as well as students' phones, are taken away by the test's proctor before the test begins; the rule outlawing smart glasses is just an extension of that existing policy.*

Although the first smart glasses emerged in the early 2010s, the technology has risen to prominence in recent years, especially as companies such as Meta and Google have debuted artificial intelligence–enabled versions of the product. As they've become more common, professors have also raised alarm bells about whether they will be used for cheating; they fear that students will use them to scan tests and get fed the answers by AI in real time without detection.

At least one documented example exists of a student using smart glasses to cheat; a student in Tokyo was caught using his spectacles to post questions from a college entrance exam on the social media site X and received answers from other social media users...

Full story at https://www.insidehighered.com/news/students/academics/2026/02/02/college-board-prohibits-wearing-smart-glasses-during-sat.

Posted by California Policy Issues at 3:20 AM No comments:

Labels: miscellaneous

Just the (Corrected) Facts - Part 3

The Council of UC Faculty Associations

- FAQs for Senate Faculty about Possible Strike by UAW; Winter 2026
- Fight for the Future of Higher Education: Academic Freedom from the Classroom to the Clinic
- Our Concerns Over Revisions to APMs 15 and 16
- Fight for the Future of Higher Ed Town Hall
- Letter from AAUP to UC Objecting to Trellix

Remaking the University

- Liner Note 48. The Faculty's Budget Fight at UCLA - 2/23/2026
- Liner Note 47. Did The Atlantic's Anti-Woke Bias Spoil its Analysis of Humanities Funding Death? - 2/16/2026
- Minneapolis Lessons for Higher Education - 1/31/2026

Higher Ed. News & Commentary

- Chronicle of Higher Education
- Inside Higher Education
- Remaking the University
- Changing Universities
- California Professor

Search This Blog

Search

UC Faculty Associations

- UCLA Faculty Association
- UCSB Faculty Association
- UCSC Faculty Association
- UCB Faculty Association
- Council of UC Faculty Associations

Other Faculty Organizations

- American Association of University Professors
- California Faculty Association (NEA)
- UC-AFT

Topics

We have been following the so-far-unsuccessful quest of the Academic Senate (Legislative Assembly) for basic budget information from Murphy Hall. A meeting of the Legislative Assembly was held on February 5th which included this matter on its agenda.

As blog readers will know from previous posts,* the Legislative Assembly and Senate leaders have requested basic budget information - essentially revenues (broken down and itemized), spending (broken down and itemized), and reserves. The information should include at a minimum, the past fiscal year, the current fiscal year (estimate), and projections for next year. What has come back is either assertions that we gave you what we have (not so), or vague oral statements, or other excuses.

Using bits and pieces of information, a partial picture was assembled by the Senate, but it is missing important information. Athletics, for example, is shown with deficits of $80 million in the past, present, and future years as a net, i.e., no breakdown of revenue and spending. But we have spent lots of money buying ourselves a new football coach and an entourage to go with him. And we are now embroiled in what is likely to be very costly litigation with the Rose Bowl and Pasadena over breaking a long-term contract to play there.

And let's not even think about the wisdom of buying a defunct and inaccessible Catholic college campus in Palos Verdes for $80 million. (There's that $80 million number again!)

Apparently, in oral statements, the CFO has blamed "facilities" costs - which seem to be energy, the labor agreement with TAs and other student workers - which is up for renegotiation, and faculty salaries. Of course, you can take any segment of spending and say that if only it were cheaper, things would be better, budgetwise. And it has always been the case that if you cut out graduate programs, hired cheaper instructors, and increased courseloads, spending would be lower. More undergrads could be processed per budget dollar. But if you did those things, you wouldn't have UCLA. You would have Cal State-Westwood.

As blog readers will know, there was a resolution proposed with lots of "Whereas" clauses that repeated the Senate's demand for basic budget information.* When it was discussed, participants raised the possibility of Public Records requests,** lawsuits by outside entities (the Senate can't sue UCLA since it is part of UCLA), and future votes of no confidence. If I were the CFO or the chancellor, I would be concerned. Just saying...

Nobody spoke against the resolution, so it seems likely to have been passed with a strong vote. (Voting occurred after the meeting electronically and the results will be announced.)

====

*https://uclafacultyassociation.blogspot.com/2026/01/just-corrected-facts-part-2.html.

**At least one such request has since been filed.

Posted by California Policy Issues at 3:10 AM No comments:

Labels: UCLA

Will Harvard Continue to Lead the Charge? - Part 118

politics (2413) UC (2114) UC Regents (1894) health care (1428) State Budget (1278) governor (1127) diversity (987) UC budget crisis (973) UC-Berkeley (915) pension (663) pensions (594) admissions (550) athletics (545) tuition (534) CSU (415) transportation (398) UC-Davis (377) online education (339) UCOP (313) uc retirement (309) traffic (301) ucrp (301) audio (291) UC enrollment (284) new hotel-conference center (282) UC-San Diego (265) enrollment (261) community colleges (248) LAO (233) UC-Irvine (185) fund raising (169) UC-Santa Barbara (163) UC-San Francisco (160) UC-Santa Cruz (159) controller (150) faculty center (144) UC-Riverside (142) ballot propositions (132) CalPERS (122) UC-Merced (117) Master Plan (110) faculty pay (109) Yudof (90) UCRS retirement (62) Faculty Association at UCLA (61) parking (61) privatization (59) CalSTRS (50) UC Berkeley (35) copyright (35) campus climate survey (28) UCRS (22) Michigan Model (18) UC Merced (17) uc funding (16) Regents (15) State Contribution (14) UCOF (14) faculty recruitment (12) UC pay (7) graduate education (6) UC San Diego (5) UCpolitics (4) UC Irvine (3) teaching evaluation (3) UC Santa Cruz (2)

Blog Archive

▼ 2026 (223)
▼ March (4)
Bad News, Good News
Straws in the Wind - Part 268
Maybe we worry too much about AI ???
I Never Promised You a Rose Bowl? - Part 15
► February (106)
► January (113)
► 2025 (1139)
► 2024 (832)
► 2023 (828)
► 2022 (719)
► 2021 (710)
► 2020 (914)
► 2019 (671)
► 2018 (595)
► 2017 (666)
► 2016 (715)

From X (Twitter): *The @DeptWar is formally ending ALL Professional Military Education, fellowships, and certificate programs with Harvard University. Harvard is woke; The War Department is not. Secretary of War Pete Hegseth*

Video below: (NOTE: If you are scrolling down this blog, you may get a notice that the video is unavailable. Clicking on the actual post will make it appear. Or you can go directly to the X{Twitter} link at the bottom.)

Or direct to https://x.com/secwar/status/2019918910502457536.

Posted by California Policy Issues at 3:05 AM No comments:

Labels: diversity, Harvard, politics

Sunday, February 8, 2026

Another Closed-Door Regents Meeting Coming Up

The Regents Advisory Group dealing with the conflict with the feds is having another 30-minute, closed-door meeting. Yours truly tends to think that if only 30 minutes is alloted, there isn't much in the way of new developments to talk about. As of now, there hasn't been a posting on the UC website page entitled Federal Updates since mid-September 2025. But, who knows?*

February 7, 2026

TO THE REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA:

Because the membership of the Advisory Group on Research and Programs Funding Legal Issues ("Advisory Group") includes five members of the Regents' Governance Committee, there exists the potential for having present a quorum of a Regents' Committee when the advisory committee meets.

This notice of meeting is served in order to comply fully with pertinent open meeting laws.

► 2015 (765)
► 2014 (704)
► 2013 (776)
► 2012 (839)
► 2011 (738)
► 2010 (431)
► 2009 (12)

Contributors

- California Policy Issues
- Toby Higbie
- UCLA Faculty Association

On Tuesday, February 10, 2026, there will be a Closed Session, Special Meeting of the Regents' Governance Committee concurrent with the Advisory Group to discuss Research and Programs Funding Legal Issues (Closed Session Statute Citation: Litigation [Education Code section 92032(b)(5)].)

The meeting will convene at 4:00 p.m. at 1111 Franklin Street, Oakland and adjourn at approximately 4:30 p.m.

(Advisory Group members: Regents Anguiano, Cohen, Hernandez, Leib, Matosantos, Milliken, Reilly, Robinson, Sarris, and Sures)

Source: https://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/regmeet/feb26/meeting-notice_federal-february-10-2026.pdf.

===

*https://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/federal-updates.

Posted by California Policy Issues at 3:35 AM No comments:

Labels: politics, UC Regents

Aimée Dorr

From the UCLA Newsroom: *Aimée Dorr, the former dean of the UCLA Graduate School of Education & Information Studies and provost of the University of California system, died Jan. 25 at her home in South Pasadena, California. She was 83. A longtime professor of education and academic leader at UCLA, Dorr took the helm of the graduate school in 1999 and over the next 13 years helped transform it into a national leader in both education and information studies. Her vision, centered on the importance of making a difference through scholarship and professional practice, emphasized equity, access and bridge-building that brought the expertise of the school's faculty and staff into Los Angeles communities.*

"As dean, Aimée helped set the course for the newly formed UCLA Graduate School of Education & Information Studies, bringing together the departments of education and information studies to pursue research, scholarship and practice within and across their respective fields," said Christina (Tina) Christie, the Wasserman Dean of the UCLA School of Education & Information Studies. "Her vision and leadership helped our school develop future generations of scholars, teachers, information professionals and institutional leaders and established a powerful commitment to the principles of responsibility and social justice, an ethic of caring, and deep partnership with communities that continue to guide our work today." ...

In July 2012, just days after stepping down as dean of the UCLA Graduate School of Education & Information Studies after 13 years — and after nearly 31 years at UCLA — Dorr assumed the role of provost and executive vice president for academic affairs of the University of California, serving as the system's chief academic officer and leading efforts to ensure the academic excellence of all the UC's campuses. "Aimée Dorr is an accomplished leader with superb management skills, strategic vision and a long-standing commitment to expanding educational opportunities for all segments of society," then–UC President Mark Yudof said in announcing her appointment. "Her inclusive management style and understanding of the University of California at all levels will serve the entire system and each of our 10 campuses very well during these challenging times."

Dorr would serve in the position until retiring in 2017...

Full release at https://newsroom.ucla.edu/stories/in-memoriam-aimee-dorr-school-education-information-studies.

Posted by California Policy Issues at 3:30 AM No comments:

Labels: UC, UCLA

Straws in the Wind - Part 247

From the Brown Daily Herald: *Brown is working with global consulting firm Teneo for its two external security assessments following the Dec. 13 shooting... According to the announcement, the reviews are set to continue throughout the semester, after which "key outcomes" will be shared with the Brown community and the public. The first assessment is an after-action review, which will assess campus safety before, during and after the shooting. The second assessment is a comprehensive campus safety and security assessment, which will look into Brown's security practices and infrastructure.*

When University President Christina Paxson P'19 P'MD'20 first announced the security assessments Dec. 22, the external organization that would be carrying out the reviews had not yet been announced, but that the Brown Corporation, the University's highest governing body, would be overseeing the reviews. The two co-leads of Teneo's review team for their work with Brown are Courtney Adante and Bill Bratton.Adante is the president of Teneo's security risk advisory team, and she has a master's degree in cybersecurity risk and strategy from New York University, according to Teneo's website. Bratton is the executive chairman of risk advisory at Teneo, and he formerly served as commissioner of the New York and Boston Police Departments and chief of the Los Angeles Police Department...

Full story at https://www.browndailyherald.com/article/2026/01/consulting-firm-teneo-to-assist-with-post-shooting-security-reviews.

===

From Inside Higher Ed: *Faculty members in the University of Houston's College of Liberal Arts and Social Science were asked to sign a three-page memo pledging not to "indoctrinate" their students, the Houston Chronicle reported. In a November email to faculty, Houston president Renu Khator wrote that the university's responsibility is to "give [students] the ability to form their own opinions, not to force a particular one on them. Our guiding principle is to teach them, not to indoctrinate them." The recent memo, sent by college dean Daniel O'Connor, asks faculty to "document compliance" with Khator's note. It's a way to ensure all faculty members are compliant with Texas's Senate Bill 37, O'Conner told associate English professor María González in a meeting. The law mandates regular reviews of core undergraduate curriculum but does not address indoctrination or what material can or cannot be taught.*

By Feb. 10, faculty must signal their agreement with the following five statements: "A primary purpose of higher education is to enhance critical thinking;" "Our responsibility is to give students the ability to form their own opinions, not to indoctrinate them;" "I understand the definition and attributes of critical thinking;" "I design my courses and course materials to be consistent with the definition and attributes of critical thinking;" and "I use methods of instruction that are intended to enhance students' critical thinking." ...

Full story at https://www.insidehighered.com/news/quick-takes/2026/02/06/houston-faculty-must-pledge-not-indoctrinate-students.

Posted by California Policy Issues at 3:20 AM No comments:

Labels: academic freedom, Brown University, politics, U of Houston

Naming

At the upcoming Feb. 12th meeting of the systemwide Assembly of the Academic Senate, a name is up for a change:

Amendments to Academic Senate Bylaw 140

Background and Justification: At its January 28, 2026 meeting, following a systemwide Senate review, the Academic Council approved revisions to Senate Bylaw 140 to update the name of the University Committee on Affirmative Action, Diversity, and Equity (UCAADE). The revised name—University Committee on Diversity and Equity (UCODE)— and committee charge remove references to "affirmative action" while retaining the committee's existing core responsibilities.

During the systemwide review of an earlier, more extensive proposal, comments from Senate divisions and committees indicated broad support for removing "affirmative action" from the committee's name.

However, reviewers raised significant concerns about other proposed revisions, noting that they would weaken UCAADE by eliminating explicit references to diversity, removing language naming historically marginalized groups, and diluting core functions related to data collection, evaluation, coordination, and reporting. Several divisions expressed concern that the proposed revisions reduced clarity and accountability and could be perceived as politically motivated or overly reactive to external pressures.

Reviewers emphasized the importance of maintaining clear authority, scope, and accountability mechanisms, including the committee's role in tracking inequities, coordinating divisional Senate committees, maintaining institutional memory, and producing regular reports.

In response to this feedback, UCAADE returned to the Academic Council with a significantly narrowed proposal limited to removing the term "affirmative action" from its name and corresponding references in its charge. No other substantive changes to the committee's responsibilities were proposed.

UCAADE was established during a period when the University of California, like many institutions nationwide, sought to address longstanding structures of inequity affecting students, faculty, and staff. **In the current environment, increased sensitivity to the term "affirmative action" and its potential misinterpretation, particularly in relation to Proposition 209, prompted the committee to reconsider the continued references to this term. Although "affirmative action" does not refer to activities prohibited by Proposition 209, UCAADE determined that retaining the term may cause public confusion.** UC does not practice affirmative action and remains in full compliance with state law; however, the committee's work to promote equity, diversity, and the elimination of discrimination remains essential. Removing the term from the committee's name clarifies this distinction and reduces the risk of misinterpretation, while preserving the committee's mission and functions.

The University Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction (UCRJ) found that the proposed amendments are consistent with the Code of the Academic Senate.

Per Senate Bylaw 116.E, modification of a Senate bylaw requires the approval of two-thirds of all voting Assembly members present.

ACTION REQUESTED: The Assembly is asked to approve the proposed revisions to Senate Bylaw 140.

Source: https://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/_files/assembly/assembly-agenda-2-12-26.pdf (p. 16)